DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 298 396 CG 021 077

AUTHOR Elings, Joette Renee
TITLE The Effects of Parenting Styles on Children's Self-Esteem: A Developmental Perspective.
PUB DATE May 88
NOTE 47p.; Doctoral Research Paper, Biola University.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adolescents; Age Differences; *Child Rearing; *Children; Developmental Stages; Discipline; *Individual Needs; *Parent Child Relationship; Parent Influence; Parenting Skills; Power Structure; *Self Esteem
IDENTIFIERS *Authoritarian Behavior; Authority

ABSTRACT

The effects of parenting styles on children's self-esteem were examined by dividing the empirical literature into three age groups: the preschool child; the elementary child; and the adolescent. Major literature reviews by W. C. Becker, B. Martin, and E. E. Maccoby and J. A. Martin are discussed and inconsistencies among the reviews are examined. Methodological issues involved in doing research on parent-child variables and self-esteem are considered, including problems associated with subjects as informants, observational data, situations and themes, the issue of control, and research on self-esteem. Results of the literature review are presented which showed that: (1) in preschoolers, authoritative parenting was associated with girls' self-esteem, but fathers' authoritative parenting was associated with low self-esteem in preschool boys; (2) at the elementary age, both mothers' and fathers' permissiveness and mothers' authoritativeness were associated with boys' self-esteem; and (3) for adolescents, lack of rigid control, high support, and limit-setting accompanied by communication were positively associated with self-esteem. It is suggested that these tentative guidelines must be tempered by the fact that each child is different. Individual differences were not taken into account in the research, making it even more important for the parents to be aware of their child's individual needs and their responses to disciplinary styles. (Author/ABL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED298396

THE EFFECTS OF PARENTING STYLES ON CHILDREN'S SELF-ESTEEM: A DEVELOPMENTAL PERSPECTIVE

BY

JOETTE RENEE ELINGS

APPROVED:

Robert B. Langelier PhD Date 5/31/88
First Reader

Kenneth Polite, Ph. D. Date 5/31/88
Second Reader

CG 021077

APPROVED:

L. Bruce Thompson, Ph.D.
Dean

5/31/88
Date

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Joette Elings
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

THE EFFECTS OF PARENTING STYLES ON CHILDREN'S SELF-ESTEEM: A DEVELOPMENTAL PERSPECTIVE

A Doctoral Research Paper
Presented to
The Faculty of the Rosemead School of Psychology
Biola University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Psychology

---

by
Joette Renee Elings
May 1988

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION. 1

MAJOR LITERATURE REVIEWS. 3

Becker (1964). 3

Martin (1975). 6

Maccoby and Martin (1983). 8

Inconsistencies Among the Reviews. 13

METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES 17

Subjects as Informants 18

Observational Data. 19

Across Situations and Times. 19

The Issue of Control. 19

Research on Self-Esteem. 20

DEVELOPMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS IN PARENTING STYLES. 21

The Preschool Child. 22

The Elementary Child. 26

The Adolescent. 32

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS. 36

REFERENCES. 39

ABSTRACT

THE EFFECTS OF PARENTING STYLES ON CHILDREN'S SELF-ESTEEM: A DEVELOPMENTAL PERSPECTIVE

Joette Renee Elings

The effects of parenting styles on children's self-esteem were examined by dividing the empirical literature into three age groups: (a) the preschool child, (b) the elementary child, and (c) the adolescent. In preschoolers, authoritative parenting was generally associated with girls' self-esteem, but fathers' authoritative parenting was assoicated with low self-esteem in preschool boys. At the elementary age, both mothers' and fathers' permissiveness is positively associated with girls' self-esteem, whereas fathers' permissiveness and mothers' authoritativeness is positively associated with boys' self-esteem. For adolescents, lack of rigid control, high support, and limit-setting accompanied by communication are all positively associated with self-esteem.

The Effects of Parenting Styles on Children's Self-Esteem:
a Developmental Perspective

Self-esteem plays an important part in people's daily experiences and influences their interpersonal behaviors. Coopersmith (1967) found that people with high self-esteem approach tasks with the expectation that they will be successful. They are also described as having greater social independence, creativity and more assertive and vigorous social actions. "They are more likely to be participants than listeners in group discussions, they report less difficulty in forming friendships, and they will express opinions even when they know these opinions may meet with a hostile reception" (p. 71). People with low self-esteem were found to lack trust in themselves and experience apprehension in social situations. They were also seen to be withdrawn because of a "marked self-consciousness and preoccupation with inner problems [which is likely to result in a] morbid preoccupation with their difficulties" (p. 71).

Since self-esteem affects our lives so pervasively, it is important to examine how it develops. It is believed that we judge ourselves according to how we think others are viewing us (Cooley, 1902; Mead,1934). The things that others attend to in our behavior make us more aware of ourselves in that area. This has been seen to lead to the subsequent reactions of conformity, embarrassment, pride, or simple awareness of our salient characteristics (Carver & Scheier, 1978; Scheier & Carver, 1977). In fact, it has been pointed out that our perceptions of another's ratings of us outweigh their actual assessments and correlate positively with self-perceptions (Gergen, 1965, 1972; Quarentelli & Cooper, 1966).

The parental style of discipline is a key factor in the development of children's self-perceptions. Dorr (1983) has suggested that discipline may be looked at as serving certain specific functions:

> One may cite three major objectives of discipline. The first is to protect the child against external dangers and the results of childish impulsiveness. The second is

> to promote psychological development. Some degree of order and routine is necessary for a child to acquire the skills necessary for academic achievement and success in the work world. Children learn frustration tolerance by learning to moderate their desires, and they develop conscience by dealing with the consequences of their actions. Empathy, or consideration of basic human need, is taught through discipline. Third, discipline encourages efficient group functioning. Limits must often be set on group activities to promote orderly, on-task behavior. (p. 1)

The particular parenting style may have an important impact on how children view themselves. This in turn would affect how confident children are in their abilities to face adult responsibilities. It is therefore important to determine what types of parenting styles are most conducive to raising children with a positive self-perception. In this area, Briggs (1970) asserted that children raised under authoritarian rule are led to feel that they cannot trust their own capacity to reason or judge. In contrast, children raised in an overly permissive environment are considered to be self-centered and demanding. They also are thought to have difficulty adjusting to the limits of the classroom and society in general (p. 237). Further examination of these principles will follow.

The focus of this paper is to review the empirical research on parental styles and their impact on children's self-esteem. The initial research was obtained by doing a cursory manual search under the descriptors of self-esteem, permissiveness, authoritarian, and parent-child relations. Then a computer search was undertaken in "Psych Info" utilizing various descriptors for parenting (childrearing practices, parent permissiveness, parental role, parental nurturance, and parent-child relations), and child/adolescent emotional development for the years 1977-1987. Since Baumrind's (1971) research seemed to be a key work in this area, a second computer search was done using her descriptors (childrearing practices, parental discipline, parental authority; and parent-child relations), specifying the parameters to deal with children only, and narrowing the years from 1980 to the present. A final computer search was completed using Baumrind's parenting descriptors and various synonyms for self-esteem. In this search, the date was specified to start with the present and go backwards to collect the most recent fifteen articles. After these articles were specified, they were incorporated if they were relevant to the topic.

The paper will begin by addressing three major literature reviews on parenting styles. Trends in the data dealing with the effects of parenting factors on a variety of children's behaviors will be presented. The third review's emphasis of self-esteem will be highlighted in the paper. Then, inconsistencies among the reviews will be examined.

Before the empirical articles are presented, the methodological issues involved in this type of research will be addressed. The articles will then be examined in light of developmental ages. Given the differences in age, the following question must be addressed: "Are different parenting styles more appropriate for children of different ages?" A limited number of other articles examining concepts indirectly related to self-esteem will also be included. Since many articles examine sex differences, the various parent-child dyads will be examined separately in this paper.

Before the developmental perspective is addressed, however, it is important to get some background in the previous findings on parental disciplinary styles. The three reviews that follow represent major reviews done in this area in 1964, 1975, and 1983, respectively.

Major Literature Reviews

Becker (1964)

Becker introduced his work by discussing the difficulty of separating discipline from other parent behaviors, such as demonstrating affectionate relations. He proposed that an examination of the various aspects of parental behavior, in relationship to one another, will increase our understanding in this area. One way of doing this is by looking at the interactions among orthogonal factors of parental characteristics.

Investigators commonly use factor analysis to determine the minimum number of orthogonal (uncorrelated) dimensions that account for correlations among variables. Using factor analysis, Schaefer (1959, 1961) developed the "Hypothetical Circumplex Model for Maternal Behavior," which suggested that studies of parental behavior from the previous two decades could be represented by a combination of two main dimensional concepts: love versus hostility and control versus autonomy.

In Becker's attempts to tie the previous studies together with those specifically addressing discipline, he too ran a series of factor analyses. The results of his work

suggested that at least three general dimensions were important to address when looking at parental behavior. Schaefer's orthogonal dimensions were retained but the control/autonomy dimension was subdivided. Becker's proposed modification was to view the data in terms of the orthogonal factors: warmth versus hostility, restrictiveness versus permissiveness, and anxious emotional involvement versus calm-detachment. These dimensions were then described as follows:

> The warmth versus hostility dimension is defined at the warm end by variables of the following sort: accepting, affectionate, approving, understanding, child-centered, frequent use of explanations, positive response to dependency behavior, high use of reasons in discipline, high use of praise in discipline, low use of physical punishment, and (for mothers) low criticism of husband. The hostility end of the dimension would be defined by the opposite characteristics. The restrictiveness versus permissiveness dimension is defined at the restrictive end by: many restrictions and strict enforcement of demands in the areas of sex play, modesty behavior, table manners, toilet training, neatness, orderliness, care of household furniture, noise, obedience, aggression to sibs, aggression to peers, and aggression to parents. Anxious emotional involvement versus calm-detachment is defined at the anxious end by: high emotionality in relation to child, babying, protectiveness, and solicitousness for the child's welfare. (p. 174, emphasis added)

Although these three dimensions represent Becker's mental framework for organizing the data, his direct reference to them in his summary is less apparent. The major focus of the paper deals with "disciplinary types." Initially, affective components are included in the discussion in a comparison between Love-Oriented and Power-Assertive techniques. Then the dimension of restrictiveness/permissiveness is examined in different affective atmospheres. The Emotional-Involvement versus Calm Detachment dimension is not elaborated because, as Becker put it, there is an "absence of direct research relating emotional-involvement versus calm-detachment to disciplinary practices" (p. 176).

A general summary of Becker's findings will be discussed in the next section. To remain consistent with his review, the section on Love-Oriented and Power-Assertive techniques will be discussed in a separate section and be referred to in terms of the disciplinary motives and communication styles.

Love Oriented and Power-Assertive Techniques

Love-oriented and power-assertive techniques of discipline have been studied in relation to child characteristics ranging from aggression to the process of internalization and conscience formation. Becker defines these terms as follows: love-oriented techniques include positive methods involving the use of praise and reasoning, and negative methods that threaten the love relation to the parent, such as, isolating the child from the parent, showing disappointment, and withdrawing love. Power-assertive techniques most typically refer to physical punishment and may even be extended to include yelling, shouting, forceful commands, and verbal threats.

Becker found that love-oriented techniques of discipline tend to be used by warm parents and promote acceptance of self-responsibility, guilt, and internalized reactions to transgression. The elements suggested as facilitating these behaviors were the affective tie between parent and child, parental modeling, verbal cues and reasoning, and the timing of punishment and its termination.

Power-assertive techniques tend to be used by hostile parents and promote aggression in young children, resistance to authority, power assertion toward other children, and externalized reactions to transgression (the fear of punishment and projection of hostility). Evidence suggested that, perhaps in time, the consistent use of this form of discipline leads to an inhibition of overt aggression, but that the hostility generated is still detectable in the form of prosocial aggression and self-aggression. Sears (1961) assessed prosocial aggression with questions about "law enforcement, strictness of control, punishment for rule breaking, and insistence on appropriate rules about aggression" (p. 471). Self-aggression, defined as injury or punishment to the self, was assessed by questions measuring "impulses toward suicide, self-punishment from other sources than the self, and accidents to the self" (p. 471).

After the section on disciplinary motives and communication styles, Becker turned to a discussion of parenting styles. The brief summary of findings and sources that follows was taken from a table of parenting styles and associated child variables. The table

represented a 2 X 2 matrix of the two major orthogonal dimensions Becker presented in the review.

Parenting Styles

Children raised with warm/restrictive parents were seen as submissive, dependent, polite, neat, obedient (Levy), had minimal aggression (Sears), were dependent, not friendly, and not creative (Watson), and demonstrated maximal compliance (Meyers), and boys showed maximum rule enforcement (Maccoby).

Children raised with hostile/restrictive parents were seen as having "neurotic" problems (clinical studies), were more quarrelsome and shy with peers (Watson), were socially withdrawn (Baldwin) and low in adult role taking (Levin), and boys had maximal self-aggression (Sears).

Children raised with warm/permissive parents were seen as active, socially outgoing, creative, successfully aggressive (Baldwin), were facilitated in adult role taking (Levin), were independent, friendly, and creative, and had low projective hostility (Watson). Boys showed minimal rule enforcement (Maccoby) and minimal self-aggression (Sears).

Children raised with hostile/permissive parents were seen as delinquent (Gluecks, Bandura & Walters) and noncompliant (Meyers) and showed maximal aggression (Sears).

In the review, Becker claimed the most beneficial parenting style was the warm-permissive style. This was characterized, in his terms, as providing socialization mainly through love, good models, reasons and trial-and-error learning of how the child's actions (although at times a bit uncontrolled) have an impact on others.

The next review was done a decade later. In spite of that length of time, the same two factors were used to organize the material. It seems that there were no major modifications in the approach to the literature review. The only change was stylistic, organizing the data by child variables as opposed to parent variables.

Martin (1975)

Martin's stylistic change seems to be a result of addressing the bidirectional theme. Whereas Becker merely gave lipservice to the fact that demonstration of causality (parenting styles leading to child behavior) is not possible, Martin spent several pages developing the bidirectional theme.

Many of the studies regarding the child's involvement in the interaction deal with the mother-infant relationship and attachment behavior. Genetic factors that influence individual differences in social responsiveness, contact-seeking and fearfulness are seen as factors that the child brings to the relationship. The relationship with mother depends in part on how the child responds to her and how he or she reinforces her for their interaction.

After this initial introduction, Martin proceeded with the examination of the variables dealing with parent behavior and child behavior. Although he arranged the data by child variables, most of the same areas were addressed.

Again, love-oriented and power-assertive techniques were separated from the main body of material. These topics can be found under Martin's heading of "internalization." After this section, Martin's discussion turned to specific child variables and the associated parent characteristics. A brief synopsis of results will be reported from his summaries of each section.

Parenting Styles

In Martin's summary, it seems that the warm/restrictive style may represent the best parenting technique. This style, involving demands for age-appropriate behavior and the firm enforcement of rules, was related to independence in children. Achievement also tended to increase with high demands from parents. Although these parental behaviors sound like restrictive rather than permissive behaviors, there appears to have been a shift in the meaning of restrictiveness. Instead of a narrow definition of restrictivenss referring only to parental behaviors that limit the child's activities, Martin included parental behaviors that encourage and even push the child to grow in autonomy and skill development. In this parenting style, the restrictiveness was accompanied by warmth and by encouraging and listening to the child. The findings for Martin's warm/restrictive parenting style contradict Becker's conclusions that found dependent behavior in children to be associated with warm/restrictive parenting.

The hostile/restrictive parenting combination was associated with aggression in children. It was not consistently demonstrated to be related to withdrawn-neurotic behavior, however. This latter finding contradicts Becker's conclusions.

The permissive style, taken by itself, was shown to be related to aggression in children six and older. In this case, Martin's term for permissiveness was viewed apart from the warm/hostility dimension and the term for aggression was less specific than Becker's. Becker found that permissiveness resulted in "successfully aggressive" behavior if parents were warm, whereas permissiveness was related to "delinquency and maximal aggression" if parents were hostile. Given the general term for aggression in Martin's work, there was no clear contradiction between the two reviews.

Finally, when parental hostility was taken by itself, it was seen to be related to withdrawn-neurotic behavior. In contrast, this result was only demonstrated by Becker if the parent was also controlling.

Given the stylistic differences in the two articles, a direct comparison of the results was difficult to make. Martin did not set out the matrix of dimensions as Becker had and therefore tended to treat the dimensions separately in his results sections.

The review by Maccoby and Martin (1983) returned to an organizational structure of analyzing the data by parent variables and of analyzing the interaction between dimensions using a matrix. The general findings on parenting will be presented from the synopsis they gave at the end of each major section. After their general conclusions for each parenting style are presented, the specific information presented on parental antecedents of self-esteem will be addressed.

Maccoby and Martin (1983)

Maccoby and Martin very explicitly set out the changes they instituted compared to the last review. They described the orthogonal dimensions previously used by Becker and then proposed changes in the two dimensions. They based their modifications on the research advances that changed from using merely parental interviews and questionnaires to using home observations and child reports as well. These changes had apparently revealed new factors or more appropriate ways of looking at the old factors.

The first dimension was changed significantly from Becker's warmth versus hostility. The modified dimension referred also to caring versus rejecting or being overprotective versus encouraging independence.

The control dimension was also changed. It had evolved through Schaefer's control/autonomy dimension and Becker's restrictive/permissive dimension to addressing other factors. This dimension now focused on psychological autonomy-giving versus psychological control (i.e., control through arousing guilt), firm versus lax control (i.e., lack of simple restrictiveness), maturity demands, degree of parental involvement, and child-centered or parent-centered behaviors.

With these changes in mind, Maccoby and Martin set out their own orthogonal dimensions which in turn were used to describe four styles of parenting. The first dimension was renamed Accepting, Responsive, and Child-Centered versus Rejecting, Unresponsive, and Parent-Centered; and the second was renamed Demanding and Controlling versus Undemanding and Low in Control Attempts. The resulting combinations describe the following parenting styles:

The authoritative-reciprocal parenting style, which is high in bidirectional communication, is described as being high on both the Accepting, Responsive, and Child-Centered dimension and on the Demanding and Controlling dimension. The indulgent parenting style is described as being high on the Accepting, Responsive, and Child-Centered dimension and the Undemanding and Low in Control Attempts dimension. The authoritarian parent, who uses power assertive techniques, is described as being high on the Rejecting, Unresponsive and Parent-Centered dimension and the Demanding and Controlling dimension. The neglecting or indifferent parenting style is described as being high on the Rejecting, Unresponsive and Parent-Centered dimension and the Undemanding and Low in Control Attempts dimension.

The authors acknowledged that this classification scheme does not fit all studies. Studies not designed to fit their scheme were placed where they fit best or organized under a separate section. The focus of the next section will be on the child characteristics associated with the parenting styles. Any conclusions directly related to self-esteem will be emphasized.

Authoritarian-Autocratic Pattern

The results for children with these parents present a rather bleak picture. Children of authoritarian parents tend to lack social competence with peers, tend to withdraw, do not

take social initiative, and lack spontaneity. They do not evidence differences in resistance to temptation, but show lesser evidence of conscience and are more likely to have an external rather than an internal moral orientation. In boys there is evidence that motivation for intellectual performance is low. Studies also link authoritarian parenting with both low self-esteem and an external locus of control in children.

In the section dealing specifically with self-esteem, the only studies presented were by Coopersmith (1967) and Loeb, Horst, and Horton (1980). In Coopersmith's study of preadolescent boys with their mothers, the authoritarian parenting style was associated with low self-esteem. Loeb et al. studied the parents of high versus low self-esteem fourth-and fifth-grade children. They found that a directive teaching style, physically taking over or giving direct verbal orders/directions, as opposed to a style leaving some freedom of choice, was found more often in parents of low self-esteem children. Loeb concluded from this study and one conducted previously, that "high levels of parental authoritarian control will impart to children a sense that they are not trusted to undertake activities independently--that they are not considered competent" (Maccoby & Martin, p. 41).

Based on this review the authoritarian parenting style was related to low self-esteem in children. These results were only reported for preadolescent children, however. Generalization to other age groups must be considered tentatively.

Authoritative-Reciprocal Pattern

Again, the conclusions in this review contradicted Becker's conclusions about the authoritative pattern. Whereas children's dependency and submissiveness were found to be associated with this parenting style in Becker's work, such an association was not found in Maccoby and Martin's review. Instead, children raised under this style of parenting were seen as independent and "agentic" (i.e. demonstrating self-assertion) in both the cognitive and social spheres, socially responsible, able to control aggression, self-confident, and high in self-esteem (p. 48).

In the section specifically addressing self-esteem, Coopersmith (1967) was again cited. He found that, contrasted with the parents of low esteem boys, parents of high self-esteem boys set higher standards for competence and obedience and consistently enforced these standards. Parents were also reported to engage in a "democratic" style of decision-making

which allowed the children to question parental viewpoints. Also, the boys of this group often felt that when punishment was administered, it was done so fairly. Other studies were cited that substantiated the conclusion that parents of high self-esteem children exercise a fairly high level of firm control (Comstock, 1973; McEachern, 1973).

In light of the findings presented in the authoritarian and authoritative sections, Maccoby and Martin claimed that there has been only equivocal support for the hypothesis that high parental control implies lack of trust in the child and hence fails to foster the child's self-esteem. To highlight the mixed results on parental control, they first referred to the studies on authoritarian parenting and low self-esteem (Coopersmith,1967; Loeb et al., 1980). The negative impact of authoritarian control was further supported by two studies asserting a positive relationship between permissiveness and high self-esteem (Apolonio, 1975; Qadri & Kaleem, 1971). Finally, three studies that supported a positive relationship between authoritative/democratic control and high self-esteem were presented (Comstock, 1973; Coopersmith, 1967; McEachern, 1973). Maccoby and Martin then concluded that "the weight of the evidence would appear to be that neither authoritarian control nor unalloyed freedom and permissiveness is the key to the development of high self-esteem in children" (p. 47).

The conclusion by Maccoby and Martin leaves one to question what meaning "control" is given in each of the studies examined. It seems that both the authoritative techniques, as described by Coopersmith, and the more restrictive, authoritarian techniques could be seen as describing control. They represent control very differently, however. The authoritative control is firm control that defines definite boundaries, but also has a degree of freedom and room for dialogue. This combines an aspect of warmth with the control. The authoritarian method of control also defines definite boundaries, but leaves little freedom or room for dialogue. The child is expected to abide by the parents' rules and decisions without question. Here there is a lack of warmth involved with the control dimension.

In contrast to both these types, permissiveness is often described as a lack of control. Determining which type of control is lacking will be a key factor in interpreting the results in the section on permissiveness that follows.

Indulgent-Permissive Pattern

The results reported here indicate more negative effects of this style of parenting than positive effects. This is demonstrated by the correlations associating permissiveness with the behaviors of impulsivity, aggression, and lack of independence or ability to take responsibility.

Although there was no specific section on self-esteem, Maccoby and Martin cited studies in the section on authoritarianism that directly related restrictive, nonpermissive parenting to low self-esteem (Apolonio, 1975; Qadri & Kaleem, 1971). Baldwin et al. were presented in the section on permissiveness as substantiating the negative effects of the authoritarian type of control. In the Baldwin et al. study it was observed that children of restrictive parents were obedient and nonaggressive, but also "passive and colorless in their interactions" with their nursery school peers. Baldwin argued that "a fairly heavy price was paid for parental restrictiveness: That obedience was obtained at the expense of the children's spontaneity, creativity, and the more active aspects of social competence" (Maccoby & Martin, p. 44).

Although not directly related to self-esteem, the review presented information from the Baumrind studies (1967, 1971) that addresses issues associated with self-esteem, i.e., self-reliance and independence. In her work, Baumrind (1967) found that children whose behavior was immature, lacking in impulse control and lacking in self-reliance tended to have permissive parents. Permissiveness was defined here as failure to exercise controls and failure to make maturity demands combined with high nurturance. In her later study of nursery-school children (Baumrind, 1971) she found that permissive parents had children who tended to lack social responsibility and independence. A follow-up with these children at ages 8 to 9 indicated that children of permissive parents were low in cognitive and social agency.

Again, it is clear that an understanding of the authors' definition of control is important. If control is defined narrowly indicating only restrictions on the child's behavior (i.e., authoritarian control) then, based on the results in that section, it would seem that a more permissive parenting style would be associated with higher self-esteem. However, if

control is defined more broadly to include "demands" for autonomous behaviors (i.e., authoritative or democratic control), greater permissiveness may not necessarily be associated with higher self-esteem, as Baumrind's work suggests. This issue is not addressed by Maccoby and Martin in this section.

The final section reflected the indifferent parenting style. This style is characterized by the qualities of the Rejecting, Unresponsive and Parent-Centered dimension combined with qualities of the Undemanding and Low in Control Attempts dimension.

Indifferent-Uninvolved Pattern

Maccoby and Martin stated that parent involvement is associated with a number of aspects of optimal development of children. They claimed it is difficult to tell from the correlational studies, however, whether there is an uneven distribution of effects. For example, it could be that more variance is accounted for at the low end of the parental involvement scale indicating a minimum critical level of involvement. It may be that some level of uninvolvement is unhealthy, but once a certain level of involvement is reached the effects of increasing involvement are negligible.

There is only one sentence devoted to self-esteem under this section. This statement presented the study by Loeb et al. (1980), which pointed to the fact that involvement was positively correlated with the child's self-esteem.

From the results of the three review articles it can be seen that there are considerable inconsistencies in their conclusions. Even Becker and Martin arrived at differing conclusions using the same two orthogonal dimensions. This leads to the obvious question of why these findings differ. This question will be the focus of the following section.

Inconsistencies Among the Reviews

When the three reviews are compared there are some apparent inconsistencies. Although there have been modifications in how the orthogonal dimensions have been defined and used, the basic idea behind the dimensions has remained somewhat stable and is the basis of the following comparison.

When considering the hostile/restrictive or authoritarian parenting style, the results of Becker's review (1964) and the review by Maccoby and Martin (1983) are fairly consistent with each other. Both conclude that this parenting style has negative effects on child

behavior. The only quality that they both ascribe to these children that Martin (1975) refutes is withdrawal. Martin claims that the results in this area are inconsistent and that a conclusion cannot be drawn. It seems that Martin's review is more extensive in this area. Therefore the association of authoritarian parenting with children's withdrawal should remain somewhat tentative. The behaviors of increased aggression and discomfort in peer relationships are consistently associated with this style, however.

The effects of warm/restrictive or authoritative parenting style seems to have the most contradictions of any of the groups. Becker asserted that these children were dependent and submissive. Martin's description of similar parental qualities was associated with independence and high achievement. Maccoby and Martin also drew attention to the contradiction between Becker's conclusions and their own. Rather than finding these children dependent and submissive, the children were found to be independent and highly self-confident. It is especially interesting to note that there are discrepancies in the conclusions of Becker's review and Martin's review when they have used the same descriptors of the orthogonal dimensions. The possibilities accounting for these changes will be addressed at the end of this section.

Warm/permissive or indulgent/permissive parenting was examined in only two of the reviews. Martin did not examine the matrix of factors for permissiveness, but instead chose to look at permissiveness apart from the warmth/hostility factor. Becker described children of warm/permissive parents as outgoing, creative, independent and "successfully aggressive." Maccoby and Martin described these children as impulsive, aggressive, and lacking in independence and responsibility. Both reviews agreed that these children are aggressive, but even this seems to be cast in a positive light in Becker's review. Everything in the latter review has a negative bent.

Finally, when the hostile/permissive or indifferent/uninvolved parenting style is examined, there is little to compare. Becker went into the most detail in his description claiming that these children are delinquent, noncompliant and show maximum aggression. Martin again failed to address the matrix with these dimensions. Finally, the review by Maccoby and Martin included very little information in this area. The summary section for this style is devoted to very general comments about the importance of involvement of the

parent, with no description of the consequences for lack of involvement. In the body of this section, however, there are some characteristics listed for these children that can best be summed up as lack of impulse control. This seems to be in agreement with Becker's findings.

From having summarized the major findings of the three reviews, it seems that the biggest discrepancies fall in two areas, the warm/restrictive compared to the authoritative style and the warm/permissive compared to the indulgent style. These discrepancies may be due to actual changes that took place in parent-child relationships, to changes in the definitions that were used, to new findings being incorporated into the reviews, or to new interpretations by the reviewers. These possibilities will all be addressed.

It may be that between the 1960's and the 1980's changes have occurred in parent-child relationships. As our society changes, so does the family system and its effects on its members. Since the 1960's there have been a host of liberation movements and a general push for more liberal standards in many areas of life. This liberal attitude may have affected how parents view their childrearing tasks. Parents who agree with the social changes may be more liberal in childrearing, whereas parents who disagree with such social change may be more determined to enforce firm rules to prevent liberal attitudes in their children. This impact on parenting may be reflected in the research on parent-child relations.

Another possible explanation for the change in conclusions is that there have been changes in data collection and the approaches to the study of parent-child relationships. Maccoby and Martin said that their data had changed from merely using parental interviews and questionnaires to using home observations and child reports as well. It is clear from the descriptions in Martin's review that he is making use of more than parental self-report. The differences in conclusions among these reviews may therefore be a reflection of expanding the information sources. Instead of only using the data from parents, which has potential for certain biases, outside observers have been included in many of the more recent studies. Children themselves have even been included by being questioned or observed. This change in data collection would give a different perspective on the phenomena being studied.

Finally, a third potential explanation focuses on changes in definitions of key concepts. This includes the fact that research had been conducted between the time of the reviews that may have provided a different focus on parent-child relations. Differences between the first two reviews and the final review would not be surprising since Maccoby and Martin explicitly stated they have changed the facets being examined in each dimension, and have used a broader range of sources to collect their data. However, the discrepancies are not only where they are expected. There are also inconsistencies between Becker and Martin even though they both make use of the same dimensions. Although the reviews combine dimensions by using a 2 x 2 matrix, the differences occur only in the warmth end of the dimension, not the hostile end. In other words, the discrepancy occurred between the warm-permissive and warm-restrictive parenting styles. Therefore, in the subsequent discussion of restrictiveness versus permissiveness, the warmth dimension will not be specifically mentioned, but will be understood to be the other factor in the matrix.

Becker's only definition of restrictive parenting referred to "many restrictions and strict enforcement of demands" (p. 174). This leaves some ambiguity when trying to discern if his dimension of control was more similar to authoritarian control, which strictly enforces with no measure of freedom to disagree, or authoritative control, which also strictly enforces but does provide freedom for the child to disagree.

Martin's style of presentation makes it difficult to determine which dimensions he considered in each section. However, when he did refer to elements of control they were described as: making age-appropriate demands and firmly enforcing rules while being warm, encouraging, and listening to the child. This seems to characterize the restrictive end of the restrictive/permissive dimension, yet clearly comes closer to the authoritative form of control.

The authors' definitions are clearly different. Becker includes only a restrictive form of control, i.e., control that sets limits on the child's behaviors. Martin, however, includes factors called "making age-appropriate demands." This term seems to have been borrowed from Baumrind's (1971) study on parenting styles. She distinguished two types of authority (a) firm enforcement of rules and (b) encouragement of independence and

individuality. The latter was characterized by making age-appropriate demands of the children. Subsequent research typically termed Baumrind's two types of authority as "control" (i.e., limitations placed on the child's behavior) and "demandingness" (i.e., demands for age-appropriate behaviors or encouraging/pushing for autonomous behaviors). Although not explicitly stated in the review, Martin clearly made use of the intervening research. This served to broaden his definition of restrictiveness. Therefore, even though he used the same word as Becker did, he used it to include a wider range of parental behaviors.

When the permissive end of the control dimension was examined, Becker reported positive characteristics for these children. Given the fact that he claimed the warm/permissive style resulted in more positive qualities in children, it seems again that his definition of control was more negatively cast than in the latter reviews. This difference in definition may account for his claim that the opposite style of parenting, warm/restrictive, is associated with submissive and dependent children.

Maccoby and Martin, however, reported a series of negative characteristics associated with warm/permissiveness (indulgence). Also, in both the reviews by Martin and by Maccoby and Martin, children with warm/restrictive (or authoritative) parents were seen to be independent and self-confident.

It seems that children given firm limits with relative freedom within the limits would be more likely to be independent, whereas firm limits with little or no freedom within the limits may be likely to lead to dependency behaviors. Therefore the inconsistencies could be explained by a change in how the control dimension was defined.

This concludes the historical overview of the research. The rest of the paper will deal with the effects of parenting styles on self-esteem while taking the child's age into consideration. Before this is done, however, it is important to discuss the methodological issues involved in doing research on parent-child variables and self-esteem.

Methodological Issues

Maccoby and Martin gave examples of difficulties with the various forms of empirical research. Each method of data collection has advantages and disadvantages. At the

present, there is no one method that has been found to be totally satisfactory for this type of research. A presentation of the major problems with data collection follows.

Subjects as Informants

In the past parents have typically served as the major source of information on both parenting styles and child behaviors. This has some obvious advantages. The parent is able to assess and report on behavior that varies across situations, giving a representation of fairly stable qualities in their children.

Parents, however, may not be aware of certain aspects of their own behavior. When they are asked to report their response to their children, they may not be aware of everything they do, especially when more subtle factors are involved, i.e., withdrawal of parental affection following misbehavior. Also there may be considerable variation in how parents describe the terms being studied. A child's behavior that is fussy or obnoxious to one parent may be considered normal behavior to another parent. Finally, parents may base their reports on what they deem to be socially acceptable behavior.

A variation on the parent as informant is the recent trend of collecting data from the child. Some studies utilize data from an adult or older adolescent reflecting back to their childhood. Others administer questionnaires to younger children including questions about parental behavior. This has the advantage of tapping into the child's perceptions of their parents and how this perception affects their behavior. However, there may be a big difference in what the parent actually does and how it is perceived.

Michaels, Messe and Stollak (1983) compared parents' perceptions of parent behavior with their seven-year-old child's perceptions of parent behavior. In this study it seemed parents viewed themselves less positively than their children did. It was found that parents think they are less loving, more punishing, and less demanding than their children report them to be. When similarity between the perceptions were compared, the results were mixed. Parent-child similarity was generally found to be positively related to behaviors described as adaptive. When considering another class of behaviors described as nonadaptive, the similarity was in some cases positively related and in some cases negatively related to children's nonadaptive behavior. Many studies in this paper assessed

the child's perception of parental behavior because of the reputed connection with self-esteem. Since the actual parental behavior may differ from the child's perspective, it is important to consider the point of view assessed in the research.

Observational Data

Another method of data collection involves the presence of an objective observer. This person may either go to the home to observe interactions in the family, or may be present in a laboratory situation. The major advantage to this method is that observers can be trained to record events using uniform comparison standards.

In spite of this objectivity, the very presence of observer and the act of being observed have an effect on the behavior. Maccoby and Martin claimed that there may be a false objectivity present in observational data collection. They stated that following the initial training period there is considerable variation over research projects in how closely observers are monitored during the course of the study. This may mean that there is high reliability in observer scores initially, but that this reliability may drop over time.

Across Situations and Times

A problem encountered by researchers is that they are interested in identifying a component of either parents or children that stably differentiates individuals despite situational or moment-to-moment variance. What does it take to do this? Is it adequate to question parents? Should parents be used to provide data on how the child behaves at home? Should the teacher asked how the child behaves at school? How many environments and how many people need to be involved in the research to be sure there has been an adequate representation of the child's behavior? These are questions that have not been answered with certainty in this area of research.

The Issue of Control

In dealing with parenting styles, Maccoby and Martin mentioned that C. C. Lewis (1981) has questioned the adequacy of the control measures used in Baumrind's (1971) and Coopersmith's (1967) research. Lewis argued that their measures of parental effectiveness of discipline was confounded with parental control. When children are quick to comply, stronger forms of control are not needed, whereas lack of compliance may

necessitate stronger forms of control. The issue of causality comes into question here. Is the child's behavior the reason for the type of control the parent exercises, or is the type of control the parent exercises the reason for the child's behavior?

These represent the major issues involved in doing research on the parent-child relationship. The next section will deal with methodological issues related to studying self-esteem.

Research on Self-Esteem

Wylie (1961) has pointed out the difficulties in defining self-esteem. Psychologists have differed in their definition of the self. When the specific area of esteem is added, things become even more complex. In addition, many use the terms self-concept, self-image, and self-perception to mean nearly the same thing. The first obstacle to overcome in the research, therefore, is a clear definition of what the instruments are actually measuring.

Another problem in measuring self-esteem is that the studies have based their conclusions strictly on correlational data. Given the nature of the material, it is not possible to truly manipulate the variables in question. Although some studies attempt to approximate this condition by designating different groups of parental behaviors and then examining the behavior of the children, this is at best a quasi-experimental design. A truly experimental model would need to randomly assign children to various methods of parenting behaviors and then examine their subsequent behaviors. This would raise an ethical question. Given the data that suggest certain parental behaviors have a negative impact on children, can one justify subjecting children to those conditions for the sake of research?

All the studies in this review use correlational data. Parent behavior was measured, child self-esteem was measured and the two were correlated. Subsequent interactions with sex or age of the child may then have been done. This means that cause and effect cannot be determined with certainty in these cases.

Several problems with the research on parenting styles and their effects of self-esteem have been mentioned. The problems of biases based on the informant's perspective are offset when there are consistencies in the data across informants. Another problem with

this research is the need to carefully define the variables being measured. This is often overlooked by the authors, who assume that there is a common understanding of the terms they are using. Finally, it is important to keep the bidirectional aspects in mind. The individual studies tend not to do this.

Although there are difficulties with this type of research, the problems do not nullify the usefulness of the information. Although it cannot be determined that the parental characteristics cause the child's self-esteem, the association between parenting styles and self-esteem can serve as a tentative guideline for parents wishing to provide an optimal environment for their children.

With these factors in mind, the paper will now address the effects of parenting styles on children's self-esteem at different developmental ages.

Developmental Considerations in Parenting Styles

It is generally well accepted that children have different needs at different ages. Given this fact, one would wonder if different parenting styles would be optimal at different ages. To examine this question, the rest of the paper will be divided into three clusters of ages: (a) the preschool child, (b) the elementary child and, (c) the adolescent.

The specific focus of this paper is on children's self-esteem. It is important to have an understanding of what the studies refer to when they use the term self-esteem. Unfortunately few authors provide a definition in their studies. One of the few definitions comes from Coopersmith's (1967) study:

> By self-esteem we refer to the evaluation which the individual makes and customarily maintains with regard to himself: it expresses an attitude of approval or disapproval and indicates the extent to which the individual believes himself to be capable, significant, successful, and worthy. In short, self-esteem is a personal judgement of worthiness that is expressed in the attitudes the individual holds toward himself (pp. 4 & 5).

With the developmental perspective in mind, the results of the empirical studies on the effects of parental styles on self-esteem will be examined. The studies failed to differentiate between the indulgent parenting style and the neglecting style. Therefore, these two styles will be considered together under the general heading of permissiveness. The categories

addressed will be referred to as the authoritarian style, the authoritative style and the permissive style of parenting.

To remind the reader of the parental characteristics in question, short descriptors of parents from Baumrind's (1971) study will be presented. Her style uses the feminine pronoun to represent the parent and the masculine to represent the child.

The authoritarian parent attempts to shape, control, and evaluate the behavior and attitudes of the child in accordance with a set standard of conduct. . .She does not encourage verbal give and take, believing that the child should accept her word for what is right.

The authoritative parent attempts to direct the child's activities in a rational, issue-oriented manner. She encourages verbal give and take, shares with the child the reasoning behind her policy and solicits his objections when he refuses to conform.

The permissive parent allows the child to regulate his own activities as much as possible, avoids the exercise of control, and does not encourage him to obey externally defined standards. She attempts to use reason and manipulation, but not overt power, to accomplish her ends.

The paper will now turn to an examination of the studies. Since many of them separate sexes for their studies, the parent-child dyads will be examined separately. Characteristics related to high and low self-esteem will be presented. At the end of each section there will be an attempt to synthesize those characteristics under one or more parenting styles to determine which disciplinary style is optimal at each developmental stage.

The Preschool Child

Only one study was found that specifically measured self-esteem of preschool children (Elrod & Crase, 1980). Therefore, other research on preschool children relating indirectly to self-esteem will be included in this section as well. After these results are presented, there will be an attempt to determine the optimal parenting style for preschool children.

Factors Related to Self-Esteem

In Baumrind's research (1971), groups of parents representing the three parenting styles were examined to determine if there tended to be consistent patterns of behavior in

their children. Given her delineation of the parenting styles, this section will be organized by those three parenting styles. Any discussion of the parenting styles will be repetitive if all results are reported since each style is considered to be more or less in comparison to the other styles. To avoid this repetition, the results will be summarized in terms of the positive statements. In other words, if authoritative parenting led to more positive findings when compared to permissive parenting, the results will be considered only under authoritative parenting.

Authoritarian parenting. Since it is important for the child to feel capable of dealing with the situations he or she faces, competence would seem to be a key aspect of self-esteem. Intelligence, a specific component of competence, is highly valued by our society and would also seem to be a contributing factor to the development of self-esteem.

Baumrind (1971) hypothesized that the authoritarian style is not associated with either markedly high or low levels of competence in preschool boys or girls. Her sample, however included only children of average or higher intelligence (the children had a Stanford-Binet IQ of at least 95, with a group mean of 125). Her hypothesis is in conflict with a later work that measured preschool children with the Leiter International Performance Scale, a nonverbal intelligence test (Camp, Swift, & Swift, 1982). This study demonstrated a negative correlation between authoritarian behavior of mothers as measured by the Authoritarian Family Ideology Scale, and the intelligence of their three-year-old children ($r = -.47$; $p < .03$). When Maternal IQ was controlled, there was still a significant correlation. Further research in this area will need to be done before there can be any firm conclusion on the relationship between authoritarian parenting and children's competence.

Authoritative parenting. Baumrind (1971) measured two facets of competence-incompetence that she called social responsibility versus social irresponsibility and independent versus suggestive behavior. These two facets were further divided into seven clusters of child behavior. Six of these clusters were considered to be under the category of social responsibility, the final cluster represented the facet of independence. These behaviors were then measured separately for both girls and boys.

Baumrind discovered that girls of authoritative parents were significantly more independent than girls of the other two groups. In contrast, authoritative parenting was only associated with independence in boys when the parents were also nonconforming.

The other facet of behavior measured was social responsibility. When the girls of authoritative parents were compared to the other groups, they were found to differ significantly in only one cluster. The girls of authoritative parents demonstrated higher achievement than the other girls but they were not found to be higher in other behaviors designated as friendly and cooperative. In fact, when the authoritative parents were also seen to be nonconforming, their girls were characterized as hostile and resistive (Baumrind, 1971, p. 101). Finally there was a clear association between authoritative parenting and the demonstration of independent, purposive, and dominant behavior in girls.

Although authoritative parenting of boys was clearly associated with all indexes of social responsibility, it was associated with independent, purposive, and dominant behavior in boys only when the parents were also nonconforming.

Permissive parenting. When Baumrind's study (1971) considered permissive fathers and their daughters there was a surprising result. Baumrind found evidence that, "when combined with some degree of paternal rejection, this style [permissiveness] actually seems to stimulate and permit expressions of resistiveness to adults and indirectly to facilitate the expression of autonomous strivings of a constructive as well as a socially disruptive nature" (p. 101). In other words, Baumrind claimed that a permissive form of parenting may augment the girls' assertive and autonomous behaviors and may reduce their dependence solely on social norms.

The only unique finding for permissiveness was an inverse relationship with this style of parenting and boys' competence. The other results were incorporated into the previous sections.

Self-Esteem

There was only one study found measuring the self-esteem of preschool children. This study examined the differences in sex of both parent and child. These special pairs are presented in the following section.

Mother-daughter. Elrod and Crase (1980) found a significant positive relationship between mothers' behaviors and daughters' self-esteem. The Iowa Parent Behavior Inventory indicated that parental behaviors associated with high self-esteem included active involvement with the child, giving immediate assistance to the child, and imposing limits on the child. Attempting to find a common theme to these behaviors, the authors referred to these as "communication that the child is valued." In addition, the item "help your child recognize another person's point of view" was positively related to self-esteem in the girls.

Father-daughter. In the Elrod and Crase study the item "help your child recognize another person's point of view," which was positively related to self-esteem when mothers were considered, was related to low self-esteem when fathers were considered.

Mother-son. Elrod and Crase found no maternal behaviors to be related to self-esteem of boys.

Father-son. The authors also found no paternal behaviors positively related to high self-esteem. Paternal limit-setting and giving immediate assistance to the son was related to low self-esteem, however (Elrod & Crase, 1980)

Summary

The authoritarian style of parenting was never related to high self-esteem in either boys or girls in any study.

Qualities most typically considered to be associated with the authoritative form of parenting were positively associated with self-esteem for girls in the Elrod and Crase study (1980). It was indicated that the mother's communication that the child is valued (including limit setting) and her teaching of empathy for others were both related to high self-esteem in girls. However, some of the same qualities in fathers were associated with low self-esteem in boys. Therefore, it seems that authoritative parental behaviors have different effects on children's self-esteem, depending on the sex of the child and parent. Since there is only one study in this area, the results must be considered tentative.

Baumrind found that authoritative parents had daughters that were more independent than the other two groups. In her conclusions she claimed that authoritative parents are most likely to facilitate the development of competence through responsible and

independent behavior in young children. Further, she claimed that authoritative parental behavior was clearly associated with independent, purposive, dominant behavior in girls, but was only clearly associated with the same behavior in boys when the parents were also nonconforming.

Permissive parenting was not found to be associated with high self-esteem. The only possible exception is an indirect relationship in Baumrind's findings. Permissiveness in fathers, coupled with some degree of paternal rejection, was associated with assertive and autonomous behavior in their daughters. This may exceed the socially acceptable standards, however, and be seen as disruptive. The ensuing effect on self-esteem is questionable.

With this information, it seems that authoritative parenting is the optimal parenting style for girls of this age. The results for boys are not as conclusive. In the study regarding self-esteem (Elrod & Crase, 1980) no maternal behaviors were related to self-esteem but paternal authoritative behavior was negatively related to self-esteem. Baumrind's research of factors indirectly related to self-esteem indicated that boys tended to be independent, purposive, and dominant only when the parents were nonconforming as well as authoritative.

The results for the preschool child present the possibility of significant differences in the effects of parenting styles on girls versus boys. These findings must be considered tentatively, however, until more studies are done with the preschool child.

The Elementary Child

For the purposes of this paper, elementary ages include kindergarten through approximately the sixth grade. In the majority of the studies, parental behavior was measured in one of three ways: (a) observation, (b) the Bronfenbrenner Parent Behavior Questionnaire (BPB, Devereux, Bronfenbrenner, & Suci, 1962) which consists of a Loving factor (comprised of nurturance, affective reward, instrumental companionship and affiliative companionship), a Punishment factor (comprised of social isolation, expressive rejection, physical punishment, deprivation of privileges, and affective punishment) and a Demanding factor (comprised of protection, power, and achievement demands), or (c) the Children's Report of Parental Behavior Inventory (CRPBI, Schaefer, 1965a, 1965b)

which measures the bipolar factors of acceptance versus rejection, psychological autonomy versus psychological control, and firm control versus lax control. The instruments used to measure self-esteem varied. Again, the results will be separated by the sex of the child with general results reported initially and parent-child pairs mentioned later.

Girls

Kawash, Kerr, and Clewes (1985) ran a series of analyses on parenting behaviors and children's self-esteem. They used scores for parenting variables grouped as above the median or below the median. The relationship of parent scores with self-esteem was tested at all possible combinations of high versus low scores on the parenting variable. The resulting combinations were: (a) both parents scoring above the median, (b) mother scored above the median/father below median, (c) mother scored below the median/father above the median, or (d) both parents scored below the median. The applicable parent groups were examined for both boys and girls for all the different factors on the Children's Report of Parental Behavior Inventory (CRPBI). When measuring "granting of psychological autonomy," the resulting four groups had daughters who were significantly different in their self-esteem ($p < .02$). If both parents scored above the median their daughters tended to have the highest self-esteem. The four groups of parental acceptance did not differ significantly with regard to daughters' self-esteem.

Peterson, Southworth and Peters (1983) studied groups of lower socioeconomic mothers and their children. In all three cohorts tested, there was a positive relationship between the demandingness factor, as measured by Bronfenbrenner's instrument, and self-esteem in girls.

The other findings can be best summarized by the different parent-child combinations. Most of the studies with the elementary aged child distinguished sex of both child and parent in their results.

Mother-daughter. When studying specific parent-child dyads, Crase, Foss and Colbert (1981) found a significant negative relationship between mothers' hostile control and their intrusiveness with their daughters' self-esteem ($r = -.40$, $p < .01$; $r = -.25$, $p < .05$, respectively), whereas acceptance of individuation was associated with high self-esteem ($r = .15$, $p < .05$). Loeb, Horst and Horton (1980) reported similar results. In their

study, children and parents were observed while performing specific experimental tasks. Mothers were found to be more verbally directive with low self-esteem daughters than with high self-esteem daughters. Studies using Bronfenbrenner's measure of parental behaviors found that mothers' use of punishment and control were negatively related to the self-esteem of girls (Growe, 1980; Peterson, Southworth, & Peters, 1983).

Modell (1975) found that moderate permissiveness of mothers was associated with high self-esteem in daughters. Unfortunately the meaning of "moderate permissiveness" was not defined. In fact, Modell reported that the actual range of permissive scores was moderately permissive. Therefore the level of "permissiveness" may be closer to the freedom within limits that authoritative parents offer, as opposed to the lax enforcement of limits characteristic of permissive parents.

From these studies it appears that a form of control characterized by hostility and intrusiveness, or a high degree of verbal directiveness on the part of the mother is related to low self-esteem in elementary-aged girls.

Support is another important factor to consider in parenting styles. Growe (1980) found that mothers' support was significantly related to positive self-esteem for girls ($r = .39$, $p < .01$). The category termed "loving" on Bronfenbrenner's instrument was positively related to daughters self-esteem in all three cohorts tested by Peterson et al. (1983).

Father-daughter. Crase, Foss and Colbert (1981) examined the relationship between fathers and their daughters. They found a negative relationship between control by guilt and self-esteem ($p < .01$). Studying from a different perspective, Loeb, Horst and Horton (1980) found that while performing experimental tasks, fathers were more verbally directive with low self-esteem daughters. Fathers were also more physically directive with low self-esteem girls than they were with high esteem daughters. Fathers of high self-esteem girls, on the other hand, scored high in administering contingent rewards (i.e., fathers would reward their daughters after successful performances).

In the only study specifically examining support in the father-daughter relationship, fathers' support was not significantly related to positive self-esteem (Growe, 1980).

Fathers use of guilt or verbal and/or physical directiveness was associated with low self-esteem in daughters . In contrast, fathers who used a minimum of directiveness, but rewarded after success tended to have daughters with high self-esteem. It seems that the high self-esteem daughters needed to feel the freedom to try on their own and then gain positive feedback on their successes. General support from the father appears not to have an effect on self-esteem, however.

Boys

The results for boys will now be addressed. Both mothers' and fathers' granting of psychological autonomy were found to be significantly related to high self-esteem in boys. (Crase, Foss & Colbert,1981; Growe, 1980). Also, firm discipline, as opposed to lax, was found to be associated with low self-esteem (Kawash, Kerr, & Clewes, 1985). The form of discipline considered was an authoritarian type.

Kawash, Kerr, and Clewes (1985) indicated that the combined parents' score of acceptance, based on the child's perceptions, was significantly associated with boys' self esteem. In fact, combined acceptance scores (with both parents scoring above the median) were related to the highest mean self-esteem score of any of the groups measured. A combined perception of low acceptance (with both parents scoring below the median) was associated with the lowest mean self-esteem score. A related variable, parent attention, was positively related to self-esteem in Patterson's study of ten-year-old boys (Patterson, 1986). Taken from the opposite perspective, rejection was significantly related to low self-esteem in boys when scores for both fathers and mothers were considered (Growe, 1980).

All other studies examining parenting styles and elementary boys' self-esteem discussed their results with respect to the sex of the parent.

Mother-son. Crase, Foss and Colbert (1981) found a positive relationship between maternal acceptance of individuation and sons' self-esteem ($r = .21$, $p < .05$), whereas maternal hostile control was inversely related to self-esteem ($r = -.34$, $p < .01$). The Bronfenbrenner questionnaire gave similar results. Mothers' granting of autonomy had a positive relationship with self-esteem in boys; punishment and protectiveness were negatively associated with self-esteem (Growe, 1980). All forms of punishment were

found to be negatively related to self-esteem in the group of lower class boys studied by Peterson et al. (1983).

Loeb et al. (1980) found that maternal verbal directiveness was associated with high self-esteem in boys. Associated with this finding is the demandingness factor of Bronfenbrenner's measure. This factor measures protection, power and achievement demands. Mothers' demandingness was positively related to sons' self-esteem in two of the three cohorts studied by Peterson et al. (1983).

It seems that for boys it is important that their mothers provide certain demands or expectations without being hostile. Although boys need to be given psychological autonomy, this does not preclude a measure of guidance or directiveness from the mother.

Maternal nurturance has consistently been related positively to self-esteem. Mother's support was related significantly to positive esteem in two studies (Growe, 1980; Peterson, Southworth & Peters,1983). In the most extensive and notable study done with preadolescent boys and their mothers, Coopersmith (1967) concluded, "the most general statement about the antecedents of self-esteem can be given in terms of three conditions: total or nearly total acceptance of the children by their parents, clearly defined and enforced limits, and the respect and latitude for individual action that exist within the defined limits" (p. 236). He stated specifically:

> The conditions that exist within the family of children with high self-esteem are notable for the demands the parents make and the firmness and care with which they enforce those demands. (p. 196)
>
> The pattern for the low esteem group included in this study consists of few and poorly defined limits, harsh and autocratic methods of control. Within the limits, weak as they are, these parents are controlling, dictatorial, rejecting, uncompromising. . . The lack of standards and disrespectful treatment that prevail cause their children to feel uncertain of whether and when they have succeeded and to feel insignificant and powerless. (pp. 214 & 215)
>
> The association of nonrestrictive procedures, harsh punishment, and low self-esteem suggests that limited restrictions are indicative of lack of parental interest and are interpreted in that way by children. (p. 197)

Again, these results support the notion that elementary boys need warmth and support, but limits must be included as well to foster a sense of caring. This environment of

mothers providing direction without stifling a sense of autonomy is strongly associated with high self-esteem in boys.

Father-son. Crase, Foss and Colbert (1981) found a positive relationship between fathers' acceptance of individuation and self-esteem ($p < .01$), whereas both hostile control and control by guilt were inversely related to self-esteem ($p < .01$ for both). These results were supported by Growe (1980) who found that fathers' granting of autonomy was positively related to self-esteem and that fathers' protectiveness was inversely related to self-esteem. Loeb et al. (1980) found no significant relationship between verbal directiveness of the father and boys' self-esteem. High physical directiveness of the father was found to be associated with low self esteem, however ($p < .005$). This study also examined the effects of contingent rewards on self-esteem. Contrary to the results for girls, contingent rewards from the father was associated with low self-esteem in boys.

In the only study specifically examining support in the father-son relationship, fathers' support was positively related to self-esteem (Growe,1980).

As with mothers, it seems that fathers' use of hostile control is associated with low self-esteem, whereas granting of autonomy is associated with high self-esteem. The results for the demandingness factor are mixed for fathers, however. Physical directiveness, protectiveness and contingent rewards from fathers are all associated with low self-esteem for boys. It would appear that boys of this age may need fathers to be particularly nondemanding.

Summary

Overall, it has been found that for both boys and girls a parenting style that is so controlling as to interfere with the child's autonomous strivings is likely to be associated with low self-esteem in the children. This type of controlling behavior is associated with the authoritarian parenting style. Therefore, authoritarian parenting is consistently related to low self-esteem in this age child.

Two factors generally considered as authoritative qualities, demandingness and support, have different results for girls and boys. For girls, demandingness as measured by verbal and physical control tended to be negatively associated with self-esteem. Support from mothers, but not from fathers, was important for girls. The results for boys indicated

that demandingness from mother was associated with high self-esteem, but demandingness from father was associated with low self-esteem. Support from both parents was found to be important for boys' self-esteem.

It seems that if the same-sexed parent is lacking in hostile control, low in demandingness, but high in acceptance, the child is likely to have high self-esteem. These qualities sound much like the permissive style of parenting. Hostile control, or control involving the use of guilt was consistently shown to be associated with the likelihood of low self-esteem across all dyads. Finally, both girls and boys seem to need support and acceptance from mother and a lack of demandingness from father. Therefore for girls, qualities of mothers' permissiveness seems to facilitate self-esteem. Although fathers' lack of rigid control is positively related to self-esteem, the support or nurturance aspect of permissiveness is not clearly related to girls' self-esteem. For boys, qualities of authoritative mothers and permissive fathers seem to facilitate self-esteem. There must be some caution in using the label for parenting style, however, since only some of the qualities of each parenting style were measured by the studies. Even with this caution in mind, these findings differ from those of the preschool child. The adolescent will now be addressed to examine the qualities of parenting styles most appropriate for this age.

The Adolescent

According to Cotton (1983) the adolescent stage of self-esteem development involves a shift in emphasis. She refers to Rosenberg's (1979) description of a shift in "locus of knowledge." This shift causes the adolescent to believe that the truth about him or herself comes from within instead of without. Others still play a role in self-esteem regulation, but there is a shift in who those people are. Now peers and adults other than parents are chosen as models in the adolescent's life. This fact is substantiated by a study finding that relationships with friends explained 14% of the variance in adolescents' self-esteem (Eskilson, Wiley, Muehlbauer & Dodder, 1986). When the relationship with parents was measured, an additional 8% of the variance was explained. Although relationships with peers have a large impact on the adolescent, the relationship between adolescents and their parents still warrants attention.

There are several studies that have examined parenting styles and adolescent self-esteem. Few studies have analyzed sex differences, however. Also, there are less precise definitions of the parental variables in these studies. In the previous two sections control was defined in a narrow sense and referred to restrictions on the child's behavior. This was differentiated from demandingness, i. e., encouraging autonomous behavior and skill development. Many of the studies on adolescents give such vague descriptions of their variables that it is unclear if this distinction is being made, or if both control and demandingness are considered under the topic of control.

In light of these changes, there will need to be a change in the organizing structure for this section. The headings will now represent the salient parent characteristic that was studied in relation to self-esteem.

Controlling Behavior

Litovsky & Dusek (1985) found a significant relationship between psychological control and low self-esteem. Other studies used less well defined independent variables. In these cases, measures of parental pressure (Eskilson, Wiley, Muehlbauer, & Dodder, 1986) and parental control (Saavedra, 1977) were found to have a negative association with self-esteem. In other words, the less controlling the parents were, the higher their children's self-esteem.

Zern and Stern (1983) measured parental pressure to obey during the first 3 years of life and correlated that with the child's self-esteem at age fourteen. They found that parental pressure to obey in situations perceived as dangerous by the parents and actual obedience therein were positively associated with high self-esteem. The authors concluded that "in more trivial situations, obedience seems to impede useful exploration of the environment" (p. 247). In all cases there were negative associations between parental pressure for obedience in trivial situations and children's self-esteem ($p < .001$).

Finally there was a study that examined sex differences and social class. Gecas (1971) found that fathers' control was significantly related to a measure called "self-esteem power" (measuring self-attributions of being powerful, clever, attractive, confident and intelligent) in the group of lower class boys, but not with middle class boys. Fathers' control was unrelated to daughters' self-esteem in all cases.

Punishing Behavior

Halpin et al. (1980) measured various aspects of punishment. In the Indian population they found no positive relationships, but a negative relationship between affective punishment and self-esteem. The White population evidenced some differences. There was a positive relationship between principled discipline and self-esteem and negative associations of protectiveness, external punishment, achievement pressure, and deprivation of privileges with self-esteem.

Another study (Larzelere, Klein, Schumm, & Alibrando, 1985) found that a parent-oriented motivation for punishment (characterized by attitudes such as frustration release for the parent and letting the child know who's boss) was negatively related to self-esteem. This is consistent with the findings by Halpin and colleagues (1980). The only exception is the positive relationship found between principled discipline and self-esteem in the Halpin group's White population. Unfortunately Halpin et. al. do not define what they mean by principled discipline. One might speculate that this would include some form of reasoning or explanation in addition to the limits imposed. If this is indeed the case, this would be in agreement with the positive relationship between parents' "positive communication" and children's self-esteem found by Larzelere and his colleagues.

Accepting Behavior

Parents' accepting behavior was found to be positively related to adolescents' self-esteem (Litovsky & Dusek, 1985; Miller, 1976; Saavedra, 1977). Larzelere et. al. (1985) found that the extent to which the parent used "positive communication" with the child correlated positively with self-esteem ($p < .05$).

Halpin, Halpin and Whiddon (1980) examined groups of both Indian and White adolescents. They found a significant positive association of instrumental companionship, nurturance and achievement reward with adolescents' self-esteem for the Indian population. In the White population there was a significant positive relationship of both instrumental companionship and nurturance with self-esteem. Achievement reward was not related to self-esteem for White adolescents.

In the study examining sex differences and social class effects (Gecas, 1971), it was found that maternal support was significantly related to self-esteem power for both lower and middle class girls and lower class boys. Mothers' support was unrelated to self-esteem for middle class boys.

Finally, Rosenberg's study (1964) took a different approach in measuring a similar variable. He had high school students reflect back to the time when they were in the fifth and sixth grades. He then asked for a report of the amount of parental involvement. Students reporting an extreme lack of parental interest and involvement had the lowest self-esteem scores of any group. These scores significantly distinguished them from the other self-esteem groups.

Summary

Although peer relationships are important for the development of adolescents' self-esteem, the relationship with parents is also related to self-esteem. From the studies reviewed, it appears that the less controlling the parents are, the greater the tendency for adolescents to have high self-esteem. It would seem, then, that relatively permissive parenting qualities during adolescence are supported. This would depend, however, on the operational definition of control used in the studies.

Support is consistently associated with high self-esteem in most cases. When sex differences and social class were studied, maternal support was not found to be related to self-esteem in middle class adolescent boys. Further study of sex and socioeconomic differences are needed to substantiate this finding.

The association of punishment with self-esteem is unclear at this point. Although it was found that most types of punishment were negatively related to self-esteem in the Halpin et al. study, it is not clear if they included the variable of positive communication.

Unfortunately the lack of clarity in definitions makes it harder to draw sure conclusions. The findings for control are consistent, but the role of demandingness is unclear. It seems that it may be appropriate to allow the adolescent to have more freedom from parental control than experienced at earlier developmental stages. Additional information on the effects of punishment would help make this more clear since the types of limits and how they are enforced seem particularly important for this age group.

Summary and Conclusions

Maccoby and Martin (1983) indicated in their review that authoritative parenting was the optimal parenting style for the development of self-esteem. This was generally substantiated for girls in the preschool group. The results for boys differed, however. Maternal behavior was unrelated to self-esteem and paternal authoritative behavior was negatively related to boys' self-esteem (Elrod & Crase, 1980).

Baumrind's (1971) research also found more consistently positive effects of authoritative parenting on preschool girls than on preschool boys. In her research, however, an authoritative parenting style was positively associated with independent and purposive behavior in boys when the parents were also nonconforming. Thus the authoritative style seems optimal for developing preschool girls' self-esteem, but the findings are less consistent concerning boys.

When elementary children were observed there was a specific focus on sex differences. It was interesting to note that "permissive" qualities in the same-sex parent were associated with high self-esteem for both boys and girls. In this case permissiveness is defined as a lack of authoritarian or restrictive control. Qualities associated with the acceptance of the child's autonomy were also consistently related to high self-esteem. In contrast to the generally positive association of permissive parental qualities with self-esteem, the only relevant study found demandingness to be positively associated with self-esteem. This may indicate that the optimal type of permissiveness is not a completely laissez-faire approach, but one that encourages children to maximize their potential.

The results for elementary girls and boys with the opposite-sex parent differed. Permissiveness, characterized by a lack of rigid control, is warranted in the father-daughter relationship. The results for encouragement of autonomy are mixed for this pair. Rewarding after successful performance is positively associated with self-esteem, whereas verbally directing the activity is negatively associated with girls' self-esteem. Elementary boys seem to need a more authoritative relationship with their mothers. In this case, both demandingness and clearly defined and enforced limits are positively related to self-esteem. Support and acceptance are also consistently associated with boys' self-esteem.

Low levels of restrictive control are warranted for elementary children. The research also supports the need for acceptance of the child's individuation. These findings are consistent with either permissive or authoritative parenting. However, due to the paucity of literature examining demandingness, the role of authoritative parenting at this age is unclear. Further research that specifically measures the parents' active involvement in demanding age-appropriate achievement is needed.

Adolescents, although affected more by peers, still seem to be impacted by parents. In this research very few studies separated the sexes in their results. This makes it difficult to tell whether sex differences found in the preschool and elementary child would be present here as well. Taking both parents together and both sexes of the adolescent, it seems that "permissive" qualities were consistently associated with high self-esteem. Given the broad definitions for control used by these studies, the demandingness or push for autonomy cannot be examined separately. Therefore, the relationship between authoritative control and self-esteem is unclear. Finally, support was consistently related to adolescents' self-esteem.

Although it is convenient to use the parenting labels to refer to these results, it is most informative to examine the particular qualities involved. Some, but not all, of the factors involved in the three parenting styles were examined in the studies. Therefore, caution in implementing these practices is warranted. The most salient characteristic associated with low self-esteem is a highly controlling manner that involves no compromise with the child [authoritarian parenting]. However, the firm enforcement of limits can have a positive effect on self-esteem in some cases. In fact, when firm limits are combined with encouragement for autonomy [authoritative parenting] there is a tendency for the child to have high self-esteem. Therefore it would seem that the enforcement of limits is not as important as how they are enforced and whether there is encouragement for growth in addition to communicating appropriately high standards for the child.

It was consistently shown that it is important for children to know that they are supported and accepted. This is substantiated by the results for punishment with the adolescent. When punishment was principled and included reasoning, there was a positive

relationship with self-esteem. Communication appears to play a big part in how the parenting is received. Based on the fact that many studies used child perceptions of parental behavior, it is important for the parent to be "tuned in" to their child so that they can alleviate misunderstandings.

These tentative guidelines for parenting must be tempered by the fact that each child is different. Individual differences were not taken into account in the research. This fact makes it even more important for the parents to be aware of their child's individual needs and their responses to disciplinary styles.

References

Baumrind, D. (1966). Effects of authoritative parental control on child behavior. Child Development, 37, 887-907.

Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. Developmental Psychology Monograph, 4 (1, Pt. 2), 1-102.

Becker, W. C. (1964). Consequences of different kinds of parental discipline. In M. L. Hoffman & L. W. Hoffman (Eds.), Child development research (Vol. 1, pp. 169-208). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Briggs, D. (1970). Your child's self-esteem: The key to his life. New York: Doubleday & Company., Inc.

Camp, B. W., Swift, W. J., & Swift, E. W. (1982). Authoritarian parental attitudes and cognitive functioning in preschool children. Psychological Reports, 50, (3, Pt. 2), 1023-1026.

Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1978). Self-focusing effects of dispositional self-consciousness, mirror presence, and audience presence. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36, 324-332.

Cooley, C. H. (1902). Human nature and the social order. New York: Scribner.

Coopersmith, S. (1967). The antecedents of self-esteem. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Company.

Cotton, N. S. (1983). The development of self-esteem and self-esteem regulation. In J. E. Mack & S. L. Ablon (Eds.), The development and sustenance of self-esteem in childhood (pp. 122-150). New York: International University Press.

Crase, S. J., Foss, C. J., & Colbert, K. K. (1981). Children's self-concept and perception of parents' behavior. Journal of Psychology, 108 (2), 297-303.

Dorr D., Zax, M., & Bonner, J. W. (Eds.). (1983). The psychology of discipline. New York: International Universities Press., Inc.

Elrod, M. M., & Crase, S. J. (1980). Sex differences in self-esteem and parental behavior. Psychological Reports, 46 (3, Pt. I), 719-727.

Eskilson, A., Wiley, M. G., Muehlbauer, G., & Dodder, L. (1986). Parental pressure, self-esteem and adolescent reported deviance: Bending the twig too far. Adolescence, 21, 501-515.

Gecas, V. (1971). Parental behavior and dimensions of adolescent self-evaluation. Sociometry, 34, 466-482.

Gergen, K. J. (1965). Interaction goals and personality feedback as factors affecting the presentation of self. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1, 413-424.

Gergen, K. J. (1972, May). Multiple identity. Psychology Today, pp. 31-35, 64-66.

Growe, G. A. (1980). Parental behavior and self-esteem in children. Psychological Reports, 47, 499-502.

Halpin, G., Halpin, G., & Whiddon, T. (1980). The relationship of perceived parental behaviors to locus of control and self-esteem among american indian and white children. The Journal of Social Psychology, 111 (2), 189-195.

Kawash, G. F., Kerr, E. N., & Clewes, J. L. (1985). Self-esteem in children as a function of perceived parental behavior. Journal of Psychology, 119 (3) 235-242.

Larzelere, R. E., Klein, M., Schumm, W. R., & Alibrando, S., Jr. (1985). The effects of spanking and other parenting characteristics on self-esteem and perceived fairness of parental discipline. Unpublished manuscript.

Litovsky, V. G., & Dusek, J. B. (1985). Perceptions of child rearing and self-concept development during the early adolescent years. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 14, (5), 373-387.

Loeb, R. C., Horst, L., & Horton, P. J. (1980). Family interaction patterns associated with self-esteem in preadolescent girls and boys. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 26, (3), 205-217.

Maccoby, E. E., & Martin, J. A. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In P.H. Mussen (Ed.) & E. M. Hetherington (Vol. Ed.), Handbook of child psychology (Vol. 4, 4th ed., pp. 1-102). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Martin, B. (1975). Parent-child relations. In F.D. Horowitz (Ed.), Review of child developmental research (Vol. 4, pp. 463-540). Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press.

Mead, G. H. (1934). Mind, self and other. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Michaels, G. Y., Messe, L. A., & Stollak, G. E. (1983). Seeing parental behavior through different eyes: Exploring the importance of person perception processes in parents and children. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 107, 3-60.

Miller, T. W. (1976). The effects of core facilitative conditions in mother on adolescent self-esteem. The Journal of Social Psychology, 100, 147-148.

Modell, E. A. (1978). An investigation of children's self-esteem and incidence of behavior problems as correlates of parental permissiveness. (From Dissertation Abstracts International, 38 (7), 4473B)

Patterson, G. R. (1986). Performance models for antisocial boys. American Psychologist, 41, 432-444.

Peterson, G. W., Southworth, L. E., & Peters, D. F. (1983). Children's self-esteem and maternal behavior in three low-income samples. Psychological Reports, 52, 79-86.

Quarantelli, E. L, & Cooper, J. (1966). Self-conceptions and others: A further test of Meadian hypotheses. The Sociological Quarterly, 7, 281-297.

Rosenberg, M. (1964). Parental interest and children's self-conceptions. Sociometry, 26, 35-49.

Saavedra, J. M. (1978). The interaction between adolescents' perception of parental warmth and control and the association of these dimensions of parenting with self-esteem and self-adequacy among Puerto Rican males. Dissertation Abstracts International, 38 (7), 3372B.

Scheier, M. F., & Carver, C. S. (1977). Self-focused attention and the experience of emotion: Attraction, repulsion, elation, and depression. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35, 625-636.

Sears, R. R. (1961). The relation of early socialization experiences to aggression in middle childhood. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 63, 466-492.

Wylie, R. C. (1961). The self-concept: Theory and research on selected topics. Lincoln/London: University of Nebraska Press.

Zern, D. S., & Stern, G. W. (1983). The impact of obedience on intelligence and self-concept: A longitudinal study involving different situational contexts. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 108 (2), 245-265.